

# SPEECH

OF

## MR. C. H. WILLIAMS, OF TENNESSEE,

ON THE

### ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 18, 1850.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California, Mr. WILLIAMS rose and addressed the Committee as follows:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I have not obtained the floor for the purpose of entering into an argument on the question of slavery. Some weeks ago, when the annual message of the President of the United States was under the consideration of the committee, I made several ineffectual efforts to obtain it. At that time, could I have been so fortunate as to have secured the floor, I desired to have discussed, to the full extent of the hour allotted by the rule, the question of slavery. But since it has been the pleasure of the committee to lay aside the annual message of the President, and to take up the special message relating to California, I desire simply, if I can, to submit to the committee some practical remarks concerning her admission as a State into the Union, and also in respect to the formation of territorial governments for New Mexico and Deseret. The one simple object I have in view, is to make an humble but earnest effort to contribute my mite towards the adjustment of questions which are justly regarded by Congress and the country as paramount, in importance, to all others now claiming its attention.

Nor is it my intention, Mr. Chairman, to make use of the opportunity which I have at last obtained, of addressing the committee, by speaking to what is usually designated, "Buncombe." The Buncombe from which I came, speaks to me upon questions involving the peace and stability of the Union. The Buncombe from which I came, so far as I know, stands perfectly erect upon those great questions which are now dividing the councils of this nation, and which, as some gentlemen believe, may possibly yet destroy the Government under which we live. Would you have believed, that while honorable gentlemen have been discussing a question of this momentous importance to the country, believing, as they declare themselves to believe, that this Government (the wonder, the boast, the admiration of the age) is on the eve of dissolution—nay, sir, while some of them have even gone so far as to declare that they felt the first convulsive shock which, in every age and country has inevitably, as two and two make four, preceded the cry of "havoc, let slip the dogs of civil war"—is it not, I ask, strange that honorable gentlemen, while addressing the House on questions involving such awful consequences, should be unable to divest themselves of their partisan feelings, and to come forth as American statesmen, ready, and willing, if need be, to sacrifice themselves on the common altar of their country? And is not such a course to be deprecated by every man who desires that this question should be honorably adjusted, and that the public mind should be quieted? I do not follow so erring an exam-



ple. I should be the object of scorn and contempt to myself, if, upon such an occasion, I were capable of indulging a single party feeling, or giving utterance to one partisan sentiment. It is my duty to my constituents, who have placed me on this proud platform of an American statesman, to rise, upon this occasion, above all sectional and party views, and to look broadcast over my whole country. God knows I would be glad to throw oil upon the troubled waters, and would not seek to fan the flame which has already burnt with an alarming brightness; and I would hail with delight any fair and honorable adjustment of the question. Such I conceive to be the duty of every member of the House.

Mr. Chairman, what is the question? Stripped of all extraneous matter, it is simply the question of the formation of territorial governments, and State governments, for the country recently acquired from Mexico. The Government of the United States are owners of a large region of country acquired from Mexico. The citizens of the United States are emigrating to that region, and settling within it. It is the duty of the Congress of the United States to give them protection—territorial governments must be formed—State governments must be formed. The question is, shall we give them such governments? No matter whether the acquisition of this country was a wise or an unwise policy—that is not now an open or debatable question. The territory is ours; and the question before us ought to be met with calm deliberation, with an anxious desire to adjust it, and to quiet the public mind.

Two years ago the Congress of the United States owed to California a territorial government; but the question of slavery stalked through this hall like Banquo's ghost, and prevented Congressional action. Congress failed to perform its duty, and left the people of the territory with Colt's pistols and the Bowie knife as the common law of the land—using the language of the Senator from Illinois, (Mr. DOUGLAS.) They had remained so for two years. I appeal to the candor of every gentleman in this House, and I ask, what was the opinion of the South two years ago in relation to the slavery restrictive clause in the formation of territorial governments? By reference to the speech of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. CALHOUN,) the answer is easy, simple, and plain. He demanded in the name of the South, (for he always speaks for the entire South,) that a territorial government should be formed, leaving out the slavery restrictive clause—thus permitting the citizens of each State, composing the grand confederacy of States, to emigrate to the acquired country, and to take with them whatever was recognised to be property in the State from which they went; and that, when the time arrived to change from a territorial to a State government, they would form a constitution including or excluding slavery, according to their own views of the subject. This was the opinion of the South two years ago—this was the decision taken by the South. It is upon this platform that I now propose to stand. I believe it is all which the South ought to ask or demand. By that platform I am willing to abide. Have the opinions and feelings of the South changed? In my humble and honest opinion, they have changed. She now requires new guarantees. She has assumed a new position in relation to this matter. The continued agitation of the question has excited the public mind, and inflamed the passions of the South, until reason, to a considerable extent at least, has been driven from its throne. If, then, two years ago, the South were in favor of adjusting this question in the manner I have stated, will any gentleman answer me in candor, and say what are the reasons which induced the South to object to the same principle of adjustment now, that she was willing to accept then? What is the objection? It is that the President of the United States has assumed powers not warranted by the Constitution of the United States, and that California asks to be admitted in an irregular manner, without undergoing territorial pupilage. Suppose this objection to have been well taken and true. Is it not the duty of Congress to rise equal to the occasion, and meet it? Suppose there had been errors and mistakes, (which I deny,) and that the adjustment of the question is fraught with



difficulty and danger, does it not become doubly the duty of Congress to adjust it? How has this distinguished Senator from South Carolina acted under the increased difficulty attending this question? Did he come forward here, and stand erect on the Southern platform which he erected two years ago? No, he comes forward and demands new guaranties and an amendment to the Constitution. Does not every man on the face of God's green earth know, that if the South persist in adhering to the course of policy which he has marked out, dissolution is inevitable? Does not the distinguished Senator know that if he could succeed with his amendment to the Constitution, this hostile North, as he describes it, would run rough-shod over that amendment, as quickly as they would over the guaranties of the existing Constitution? The great slave interest of the South is now secure and protected by the Constitution. After reading the speech of that great man, I am left to the conclusion, that in his judgment the dissolution of the Union is the sole—the only remedy; that there is no other way of saving this great slave interest of the South; and for the first time since this slavery agitation first commenced, in the year 1835, he proclaims that the agitation of this question is not the prime, leading, and moving cause of the prevailing discontent of the South. He tells you that the North has become strong, that the equilibrium of political power has been disturbed, and that the slave property of the South is insecure. The following is the language of his speech:

"There is another lying back of it, with which this is intimately connected, that may be regarded as the great and primary cause. That is to be found in the fact that the equilibrium between the two sections in the Government, as it stood when the constitution was ratified, and the Government put in action, has been destroyed. At that time there was nearly a perfect equilibrium between the two, which afforded ample means to each to protect itself against the aggression of the other; but as it now stands one section has the exclusive power of controlling the Government, which leaves the other without any adequate means of protecting itself against its encroachments and oppression. To place this subject distinctly before you, I have, Senators, prepared a brief statistical statement, showing the relative weight of the two sections in the Government, under the first census of 1790, and the last census of 1840."

And how (continued Mr. W.) does he propose to correct and remedy the evils of this deranged equilibrium? He has proposed no remedy, unless the constitutional remedy which he speaks of was designed as one. I am not one of those who believe that an equal number of free and slave States is indispensably requisite to the stability or perpetuity of this Government. His demand is an impossible one, because the All-wise Ruler would have to re-make the country we have acquired, *and prepare it for the profitable adaptation of slave labor*, to which so great a portion is now unsuited. This must be done before the new demand of his distinguished Senator can be complied with.

The Constitution of the United States guaranties to the South the great slave interest; and so long as that Constitution stands, we are safe. That interest never can be wrested from us but by a violation of the Constitution, which would inevitably lead to a dissolution of the Union; and in that event the damning deed would rest upon the North, and not upon the South.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of admitting California into the Union. A great principle is involved in her admission—the right of the people to govern themselves. Such was the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy, (Mr. PRESTON,) who, as a member of this House, two years ago, introduced a bill to admit California. A distinguished Senator from Illinois, (Mr. DOUGLAS,) in the other end of the Capitol, argued ably and powerfully in favor of admitting California, at the same time. I will read an extract from his speech.

Mr. W. read as follows:

"Again: there is a government *de facto* in California. Now, I admit that it is not a good government, and for that reason it ought to have a better one. I admit that it is not a republican government, and in fact not a legal one, and that is the reason why there ought to be a legal government there. California can be admitted as a State upon the principles recognized in the admission of Vermont, Kentucky, and Tennessee, without violating any of the principles of the Constitution—without violence to any practice or act of this Government. It ought to be done



now, sir, and not postponed, for the reason that there are people enough to create a State Government, and for the reason that before another session of this Congress expires, there will be more than enough for three States. At that period, the idea of a Territorial Government will be obsolete. The question, then, is this: shall we form a State Government now, giving law and protection to the people of California, or shall we postpone action, wait a period of two years, and then do the same thing? Sir, I trust that if Congress does not act at this session, the people will act for themselves. I trust that they will come together and form a government for themselves. I trust, sir, that Colt's pistols will not continue to be the common law of the land."

Even (continued Mr. W.) the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, in 1847, introduced into the Senate of the United States the following resolution, which clearly justifies and sustains the position, that California ought to be admitted:

"Resolved, As a fundamental principle in our political creed, that a people, in forming a constitution, have the unconditional right to form and adopt the government which they think best calculated to secure their liberty, prosperity, and happiness, and in confining them to no other, no other condition is imposed by the Federal Constitution, in order to be admitted into the Union, except that its constitution shall be republican."

The Senator from Louisiana, (continued Mr. W.) also introduced the following resolution, which requires no comment:

"Resolved, That it is competent and expedient, and not inconsistent with the practice of the Government, in some cases, to admit California, or such portion of it as Congress may deem proper, immediately into the Union, on an equal footing with the other States, and that the Committee on ——— be instructed to report a bill for that purpose, for that portion of California which lies west of the summit of the Sierra Nevada mountains."—*Congressional Globe*, page 194.

The late President of the United States, (continued Mr. W.) in his last annual message, from which I make the following extract, congratulates the country upon the fact, that the danger and difficulty growing out of the question would be but of short duration, because California and New Mexico were being settled so rapidly that they would soon form State Governments, and ask to be admitted into the Union:

"In organizing governments over these territories, no duty imposed on Congress by the Constitution, requires that they should legislate on the subject of slavery, while their power to do so is not only seriously questioned, but denied by many of the soundest expounders of that instrument. Whether Congress shall legislate or not, *the people of the acquired territories, when assembled in convention, to form State constitutions, will possess the sole and exclusive power to determine for themselves whether slavery shall or shall not exist within their limits.* If Congress shall abstain from interfering with the question, the people of these territories will be left free to adjust it as they may think proper, when they apply for admission as States into the Union. No enactment of Congress could restrain the people of any of the Southern States of the Union, old or new, north or south, slaveholding or non-slaveholding, from determining the character of their own domestic institutions as they may deem wise and proper. Any and all of the States possess this right, and Congress cannot deprive them of it. The people of Georgia might, if they chose, so alter their constitution as to abolish slavery within its limits, and the people of Vermont might so alter their constitution as to admit slavery within its limits. Both States would possess the right, though, as all know, it is not probable that either would exert it."

"It is fortunate for the peace and harmony of the Union that this question is in its nature temporary, and can only continue for the brief period which will intervene before California and New Mexico may be admitted as States into the Union. From the tide of population now flowing into them, it is highly probable that this will soon occur."

But (continued Mr. W.) in order to place beyond dispute the position of the Democratic party, in respect to California, the following extract is inserted from the Union:

"The South denies that Congress has any jurisdiction over the subject of slavery, and contends that *the people of the territories alone, when they frame a constitution, preparatory to admission into the Union, have no right to speak and be heard on that matter.* This fact being settled, it really seems to us, that this exciting question might be speedily adjusted, if calm councils prevail. The South contends for her honor, and for the great principles of non-intervention and State equality. *Why, then, cannot all unite and permit California to come into the Union as soon as she can frame a constitution?* Then, according to the doctrine which prevails on both sides of Mason's and Dixon's line, she may constitutionally establish her domestic institu-



tions on any basis consistent with republican principles. *The South could lose nothing by adopting this course ; on the contrary, she would save all for which she contends.*"

What is it then (continued Mr. W.) that has come over the public mind, and produced this great change in a great party, respecting the admission of California.

My colleague from the Memphis district, (Mr. STANTON,) who now opposes the admission of California, discovered, in the letter of the Secretary of State to Mr. Thomas Butler King, who was sent to California, the remarkable words, "that he was fully in possession of the President's views upon the subject." My colleague made himself merry at these words, and spoke in strong condemnatory terms of the present Administration. From the words referred to, my colleague wishes the country to believe that General Taylor and Thomas Butler King, two Southern men, identified in fortunes and interests with the South, had betrayed the South, and that the mission of Mr. King to California was to procure a constitution excluding slavery, in order to cover up the double-dealing of General Taylor's friends in the late Presidential election. Yet my colleague endorsed Thomas Butler King as a gentleman. Mr. King, in a card published to the world, declares that my colleague was mistaken, that his imputations were untrue, and that he would have scorned to have accepted such a mission and for such a purpose. The President of the United States solemnly denies the inferences of my colleague, as the following extract from his special message will clearly show :

"I did not hesitate to express to the people of those territories my desire that each territory should, if prepared to comply with the requisitions of the Constitution of the United States, form a plan of a State constitution, and submit the same to Congress, with a prayer for admission into the Union as a State ; but I did not anticipate, suggest, or authorize the establishment of any such government without the assent of Congress ; nor did I authorize any government agent or officer to interfere with, or exercise any influence or control over the election of delegates, or over any convention, in making or modifying their domestic institutions, or any of the provisions of their proposed constitution. On the contrary, the instructions given by my orders were, that all measures of domestic policy, adopted by the people of California, must originate solely with themselves ; that while the Executive of the United States was desirous to protect them in the formation of any Government, republican in its character, to be at the proper time submitted to Congress, yet it was to be distinctly understood, that the plan of such a government must, at the same time, be the result of their own deliberate choice, and originate with themselves, without the interference of the Executive."

So completely (continued Mr. W.) did my colleague lash himself into a burst of indignation against the President and Thomas Butler King, that he declared his willingness to dissolve the Union, if California was admitted under these circumstances, as the following extract from his speech will demonstrate :

"It may be possible that the dominant majority in the two houses of Congress will have the strength to secure the admission of California, and that they will blindly exercise the power they possess. I hope that I will never see that fatal day ; but should it come, in spite of my feeble deprecations, I shall be ready to meet it with whatever sacrifices may be necessary to defend the people I represent. It is possible that the people of the South may not, at first, understand the full extent of their danger ; it is possible the evil day of separation may be postponed yet a while longer ; but I solemnly believe that day must come, as the inevitable consequence of the act it is proposed to accomplish."

Mr. STANTON (interposing) was understood to remark, that he thought his colleague was doing him injustice—that in some aspects of the case he was in favor of the admission of California.

Mr. WILLIAMS, (continuing.) I am not disposed to do injustice to my colleague, I have a high personal regard for him, and will publish an extract from his speech, from which I have drawn my opinions of his views. His whole speech clearly conveyed the idea that a dissolution of the Union was inevitable—that it could not be prevented—that it might be delayed for a season, but that if California were admitted he would arm himself *cap-a-pie*, draw the sword, throw away the scabbard, rush into the thickest of the fight, with the war cry,

—————"Lay on Macduff,  
And damn'd be he who first cries, Hold ; enough !"



My colleague, who was contemplating such a horrid destiny for his country as a dissolution of the Union—civil war and bloodshed—believing that this Government was tumbling to pieces around him, paused to give a few partisan tabs to the brave old hero at the other end of the avenue, who had staked his life on many a well-fought field of battle, and whose patriotism had won for himself and his country immortal glory. And what had the President done to justify the onslaught of my colleague?

He found that Congress had failed in a most important duty to California; and he sent a special messenger there to tell them to form a government for themselves, and that he would recommend it to the favorable consideration of the Congress of the United States.

I know that the Congress of the United States has the power, if it should think proper to exercise it, to reject the application of California, and it will be its duty to do so, if they should be of opinion that the interest of any portion of the country would be benefitted thereby. But is there a man living who believes, that if Congress should reject California as a State, remand her to a territorial condition, and permit her to remain so two or five years, a slave State could or would be formed there?

Mr. STANTON, of Tennessee, interposed, and asked if Mr. W. was willing to admit California independent of all other questions?

Mr. W. continued. I will come to that directly. I have no opinions that I will conceal. If no object can be accomplished by remanding California back to a state of territorial dependence, what is your object, gentlemen of the South, in opposing her admission as a State, when the fact stares us in the face, that every member of the convention was opposed to slavery, and that there was no undue influence used by the President, or his agent, (T. Butler King,) who both solemnly declare that they did not attempt to control public sentiment there, and when you find that they are sustained in their declarations by the Senators and members of Congress elect from California?

Mr. Chairman, though I have thus argued in favor of the admission of California, and believe it to be right that she should be admitted, yet unless the entire question of slavery, growing out of our recent territorial acquisitions, can be settled on some satisfactory basis, *I am not now certain that I will* vote for her admission. I owe it to the excited feelings of the South, to try and make the California question the basis-power by which the whole question can be adjusted.

I trust we shall soon see satisfactory manifestations that California can be admitted into the Union, and that territorial governments can be formed without the Wilmot proviso.

Probably, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary for me to say anything more in relation to the admission of California. I have felt it to be my duty, humble as I am, to protest against the speech of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, as not speaking the sentiments of the South. I now propose to speak of the power of Congress over the question of slavery in the territories. I have ever believed, as I believe now, that Congress has the power to legislate on the question of slavery in the territories. That is my opinion. It is a power that springs from the nature and necessity of the thing. It is either true, or it is not true, that Congress has the power to acquire territory. If this Government has the power to acquire, have they not the power to control it? I would to God that I could believe they had no such power, because then I should know that the great interests of the South were protected by the genius of the Constitution—I should know that we could appeal to the judicial tribunals of the country for protection. A dissolution of this Union by an unconstitutional exercise of power, never can take place, so long as the Supreme Court of the United States remains pure and firm. It can only be dissolved when the Government, in the exercise of a given power, so uses its power that forbearance ceases to be a virtue. In that case, nothing would be left but the inherent right of revolution.



I listened to the speech of my friend from Alabama, (Mr. HILLIARD,) with great pleasure. I listened also with great pleasure to the remarks of my distinguished friend from Georgia, (Mr. WELLBORN,) over the way, who, when the debate was raging fiercely, made a speech which did honor alike to his head and heart. It awakened every patriotic emotion of my soul. But what did these gentlemen propose? They both propose to prove that Congress has no power to legislate upon the subject. Yet each gentleman closed his remarks by proposing, as a compromise, that Congress should exercise its authority—thus placing it out of my power, if they had convinced me of the truth of their positions, to vote for their compromises. I believe that a majority of the people of the South believe that the power is not in the Government. I believe that it is there; it is an incidental power. Conceding the power, I would address myself to the members of this House from the North. You are, aware, gentlemen, that there is not a man in the slave States, but who believes either that it is unconstitutional, or a high-handed, tyrannical, and aggressive use of a delegated power placed in trust in your hands. Knowing this to be so, and seeing the feeling which pervades the Southern portion of this country in relation to it, it is your duty to refrain from the exercise. No doubt gentlemen lay the flattering unction to their souls, that they are governed, in their support of the Wilmot proviso, by their ardor in the cause of human liberty, when, in truth, it is a struggle for popularity, power, and place. Both of the great parties of the North have been “billing and cooing” with the Abolition party, until they have produced such a state of public feeling and excitement in the North, that, in the language of the gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. ROOT,) “they are afraid to face the music.” It is for their own interest: and if gentlemen will give me their ears for three minutes, I will make it appear as clear as the sun at mid-day, that no other motive can guide them. And I will do so by your own arguments.

Do you not know, gentlemen of the North, that you have three millions more inhabitants in the North than we have in the South? Do you not know that New Mexico and Deseret are now opposed to slavery? Do you not aver, and brag, and boast, in your places, that outside of the fifteen slave States, the whole civilized world is opposed to the extension of slavery? Do you not know that you charge in your places, that this is now free territory, and that if a man carries his slaves there, they will be emancipated? Do you not know the additional fact, that you have the power *here*; and if your position is true, that that is now free territory, slavery cannot exist there but by positive enactment? Who is to enact it? Not the people of the territory, for you know they are opposed to it. Surely you would not, with all your pretended love of human liberty here, pass a law forcing slavery upon the people there. You think more of your popularity than you do of your country. I advise you to resign your seats, go home, and let men come here who have feelings as broad as the whole country.

You charge, that it is the design of the South to force slavery into territory now free. This is a slander upon the position of the South. No such argument has been advanced. The South only asks you to leave it to the chances—the soil—the climate—the distance: ninety-nine chances out of a hundred are in your favor: are you not willing to trust us with the hundredth chance? When pressed by arguments like these, you are driven to the wall, and ensconce yourself behind the Bible and the Declaration of Independence, which you use for your own purposes, as “sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal,” to tickle the ears of the people. Why do you pursue this course? Why not come up and adjust the question? Do but this, and the question of slavery in the District of Columbia—of the slave trade between the States—of the fugitives slaves—will all follow the adjustment of the principal issue.

I have heard several members on the other side of the House declare their willingness to trample under foot the Wilmot proviso, and so to quiet the public mind; and I am also informed, from a reliable source, that there are twenty



Democrats, members from free States, willing to risk their popularity, and settle the question, and on terms demanded by the South two years ago. I honor them both for their patriotism and their courage. It has been my boast that I had ever belonged to the great conservative party of the Union—to the Whig party. It is a mortifying fact to me, that up to this hour, no Whig in the House of Representatives has yet avowed, in his place, his determination to follow the self-sacrificing example that has been set on the other side. I have ever believed that the Whig party was the great conservative party of the Union. The hour of trial is upon us, and if that great party should now fail of its duty, and should not come up to the just expectations of the country, I am for a dissolution, not of the Union, but of the Whig party. And be assured, gentlemen, that if you turn a deaf ear to our reasonable appeals to your justice, in this hour of tribulation, when you call upon us for sympathy in regard to matters in which you feel a deep, sectional interest, our response will be, Away, we know you not. But I still have confidence that we shall receive at the hands of the North the aid which we require; but not from such members as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. STEVENS,) and the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. MANN.) The gentleman from Pennsylvania grossly slandered the South. He forced upon me the conviction that, at some period of his life, he had been a political bankrupt, that he was here by accident, and that he had made a desperate, a reckless, and I may say, a dare-devil move to obtain a forward position in Pennsylvania, on what he deemed to be a popular hobby. The gentleman from Massachusetts has been referred to so often, that I allude to him with reluctance. He described in glowing colors the miseries and ruin that would inevitably follow a dissolution of the Union; yet, when appealed to, in view of all the horrors he had depicted, to say whether he would not yield something to save his country from a fate so deplorable he replied that he would not; thus proving that he belonged to the same party as the Senator from New York, (Mr. SEWARD,) who in his place, declared that he was willing “to re-enact the laws of God”—that there was a power higher than the constitution—in other words, that he was willing to commit perjury in the service of his God. A man capable of uttering such sentiments ought to be whipped with scorpions through the world.

But there are Whigs here who I believe will follow the lead of that great master-mind, whose action upon all trying occasions, has won for itself the appellation of God-like. This great man, (Mr. WEBSTER,) ever scorns to act from or be bounded by sectional considerations. Yes, Mr. Chairman, whenever his country has been endangered by exciting and difficult questions, he comes forward, erects a national platform, and covers himself all over with glory. So, his late great speech entitles him to the lasting gratitude of his country.

I must say a word, Mr. Chairman, before I take my seat, in relation to the proposed Southern convention. I believe that the call of the convention was ill-timed and unnecessary. I am opposed to it, because it proposes a remedy for a contingent evil, outside of the constitution, and because it will be time enough to take resolute steps when the deed, which alone can justify revolution, shall have been done. I will take the liberty to advise both Whigs and Democrats—the young and talented men of my State—to remain at a respectable distance from that convention, and to leave it to old men, and political cripples, who have no future before them—for nothing is more clear to my mind, than that it will prove a political winding-sheet to all those who trust themselves to its embraces.

I conclude with a sentiment expressed by an illustrious statesman (Mr. WEBSTER) upon an important occasion: “Liberty and Union, one and indivisible, now and forever.”

---

NOTE.—It is due to the Whig party to state, that on the only test question this session—Mr. Root’s resolutions—there was about an equal number of Whigs and Democrats who voted with the Representatives from the slave States.